



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUDAISM FOR THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

### II.

THE inquiry whether fixed articles of faith form the essential kernel of Judaism, learnedly discussed in this Review by Mr. Schechter, and the accuracy of the classification of the differences in religious opinion among English Jews, so cleverly elaborated by Mr. Israel Zangwill, are both internal questions which have only a very incidental relation to the real subject-matter of my former article.

I had not then, nor have I now, to deal with what may be considered as orthodox or heterodox in Judaism, whether touching the importance of the ritual or even the apparently fundamental dogma of Revelation, of which the denial in Rabbinic language is expressed by *האומר אין תורה מן השמים* or in modern phraseology, by doubt in the supernatural. According to Mr. Zangwill's classification, there is among English Jews a group of persons "professing natural Judaism." This might, indeed, occasion a practical question within the Jewish community itself. For the question might arise whether holding such heterodox opinions would unfit a man for giving evidence in a matter of ritual, as *e.g.*, in a marriage or a divorce "*more Judaico*." In such a case, a rabbi would be not a little puzzled to decide whether the marriage or the divorce would be ritually valid. For the code-book he would have to consult would not enlighten him on matters of dogma. It would, for instance, give him no information how to act in the case of a witness who had never violated the sabbath in his actions, but who was not thoroughly imbued with a belief in the supernatural command to obey it. Moses Mendelssohn's dictum that Judaism only judges actions and not religious opinions remains unshaken. Whether an intelligent Jew finds more happiness, assurance, and solace from his convinced belief in the ideal principle of Judaism and its ethical consequences than a Russian or Polish Chasid from the mechanical

performance of some ritual ceremony, and from a vague messianic hope is purely a matter of sentiment. It could only become practically important if the externalities of the synagogue were undergoing transformation. We might then have to determine whether more consideration was to be shown to Moses Mendelssohn, who rejoiced in the thought that the essentials of Judaism were in perfect harmony with deistic philosophy, or to Steinheim, who was filled with joy at the conviction that the truths of revealed Judaism were at variance with the dogmas of philosophy. Translating these differences of theory into practice, we might then have to decide whether the repulsive abuses commonly regarded as Jewish and religious should be abandoned, or whether the feelings of a naïve believer should rather be spared who finds his spiritual bliss in the noisy shaking of the willow branches upon the Feast of Tabernacles.

But, as aforesaid, these reflections are foreign to my subject. I only desire to consider whether Judaism has still a real significance and value in the critically-minded present, and in that future which may be yet more estranged from all religious forms, only to show that those who are deeply convinced of its fundamental principle and historic influence, may joyfully make it their vocation to hold by Judaism steadfastly, and so transmit it to posterity. Taking as my guides the Bible, the Talmud, and the intelligent rabbis, I have endeavoured to prove that this fundamental principle must be sought for in ethical idealism (humanity in the highest sense of the word), and in pure rational monotheism, adverse to all mysticism and disfigurement. I have also attempted to show that for the future of mankind these qualities have not yet become superfluous for the education and regeneration of society.

The immense influence, which these two most closely connected sides of the law of Moses, "the heritage of the congregation of Israel," have exercised on the development of human civilization, has indeed been freely admitted even by Christian thinkers. No matter how much Mr. Zangwill may doubt the validity of this statement and oppose to it the argument that Confucius and Sophocles, and Aryan celebrities in general, were equally impressed with the categorical imperative of the moral law, he cannot maintain that these individuals caused a world-wide and historic change in the thoughts and actions of the whole civilized portion of mankind, or that they looked upon their own convictions as material for what we may call an ethical circulation of the blood. Socrates may have had a more accurate conception of

the Deity than his countrymen and the Sophists, but only a paradoxical disputatiousness could assert that he was fully penetrated with the conviction that this conception of the Deity postulated the sanctity of life and the purest morality. Plato and Aristotle might indeed have learnt "practical reason" from the Jews, for their ethical doctrine compares most disadvantageously with that of Judaism, as was already known to Philo.

Christianity was perfectly justified in priding itself on having vanquished the essential corruption of paganism, but it ought not to have ignored the fact that it was only the organ and interpreter of an original inspiration behind it, and that it had not itself remained free from some heathen contamination. As long as Judaism was gagged and silent, Bossuet could attribute the whole progress of civilization to Christianity, a view in which Ranke, undisturbed by Buckle's conclusions, has partly followed him. But at the present day, the ban which suffered no dispute to the assertion that salvation came forth from Golgotha and not from Zion is gradually being broken through. For it is now admitted as an undeniable historical fact by many earnest Christian thinkers, such as Kuenen and Renan, and even half-and-half by German historians despite a touch of anti-Semitism, that the ethical consciousness is the property of the people of Israel, that it was called into the world by the three great prophets, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, and that they may be said to have been evangelists eight hundred years before the rise of Christianity, although without the mystic bye-taste of a kingdom of heaven. To this admission we must cling fast, without at present examining closely whether this ethical revelation was first proclaimed from Mount Sinai, or from the wilderness of Tekoa. A part, I might say the flower, of this pure ethical system, has become the common property of the world, through the medium of Christianity—justice, charity even towards the stranger, care for the poor, the sanctity of life, conscientiousness. But the world has not yet fully appreciated the root of this rich development, that pure monotheism which teaches that God is the father of the fatherless and the protector of the widow, and that, as holiness is the essence of his nature, all unholiness, unchastity, and self-pollution,<sup>1</sup> are an abomination to him. Neither has

---

<sup>1</sup> The Talmudists very keenly realised this element in the Jewish conception of God אלהיהם של אלו שונא זמה. "The God of Israel hates unchastity, bestiality."

the world always adequately realized that this lofty conception of Deity is the true teaching of Judaism.

What relation then exists between the ceremonial system and this fundamental principle or essence of Judaism? It cannot be denied that in its constitutive document, the Pentateuch, in which ethical laws fill a considerable space, we find also prescribed a whole series of ritual enactments, though the prophets treat these ordinances almost with contempt. Through Talmudism and Rabbinism they have been so improperly exaggerated, and received so enormous an extension in the various codes, that the ethical element seems to have been almost entirely crowded out, and Judaism has consequently appeared to consist of nothing but outward ceremonies, and to place the highest value in the mechanical performance of an infinite series of ritual acts. Let us now inquire whether this ritualism in *its original form* was related to the ethical element, or whether it is to be considered as something foreign to its purpose, an interpolation from without. From the earliest times, both Jewish and non-Jewish circles have been in the habit of considering Judaism as composed of two distinct parts—articles of faith and moral laws on the one side, ceremonies and ritual observances on the other. It was reckoned as one of the merits of the founder of Christianity, that he aided the progress of religious consciousness by eliminating the ceremonial law. On this view he becomes in a sense the founder of a reformed Judaism. The reform party of modern times sought to justify the transformation of Judaism by means of another line of argument. They held that the national character, which the Jewish law has always retained, was unessential as compared with its religious and ethical features, and as much of the former had necessarily been given up with the destruction of the national independence, all that had any tinge of nationality might now also be eradicated. Judaism was thus to adopt a universal or cosmopolitan character, and be able, as it were, to compete with Christianity, at any rate with Unitarianism. This is the point of view of a large number of Jews in America.

The value or worthlessness of the ceremonial element in Judaism, and its original signification, are well worth considering. That it has some deeper meaning is sufficiently proved by the testimony of the book of Deuteronomy, which was found in the temple by the high priest Hilkiah. Although it places the ethical laws in the foreground, it also enforces ritual observances, though on a far less extensive scale than in the other books of the Pentateuch.

The ceremonies must therefore possess at least a certain value and some definite relation to the ethical elements. It is worth while to investigate what this relation is.

When the prophets gave frequent utterance to the prediction, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas"—full, that is, according to our interpretation, of ethical idealism and submission to God—they did not delude themselves with the belief that this "kingdom of heaven" was near at hand. They relegated the realization of the ideal to "the end of days." The two prophets, Isaiah and Micah, who predicted eternal peace on earth in connection with Israel's mission, that "nation shall not draw the sword against nation, and that they shall not learn war again," preface this statement with the words, "and it shall come to pass in the last days." They were gifted with the prevision that the teaching which goes forth from Zion would have power to effect a great moral transformation over the whole world—in some distant age.

But how is this teaching to endure to the end of days? How is it to be taught and to spread its influence abroad? A doctrine must possess its teachers. It must therefore have created for itself an organ, an interpreter, who should proclaim it and preserve it, and lead it to victory. Not an association, pledged by contract to carry on the work, not an order which has to be constantly recruited lest it should die out, was chosen to be the bearer of this teaching, but a *tribe* which, united in itself, even after apparent extermination is ever again renewed. The oldest record, the Scriptures, tells of the selection of a race of guardians for the regenerating doctrine. Abraham was chosen, so that he might command his sons and their descendants after them to keep the way of the Lord and to practise justice and righteousness. The promise to Abraham was that he would thus become the father of many nations, because his tribe, the people of Israel, was entrusted with the mission and the task of guarding the teaching of salvation until the end of days. Such is the language of Scripture. Or did this tribe become the guardian and preserver of the teaching because in it the ethical consciousness, though but in feeble outline, had been awakened and developed very early, and it was therefore more fitted than other nations for this ethical office?

In whichever way the fact be expressed, Israel, the descendant of Abraham, has played its part in the history of the world as guardian and propagator of a peculiar regenerative teaching. The Hebrew language has created a special name for the ideal import of this tribe. It is called Jeshurun

(ישורון), of which word the etymological meaning is, "The perfection of uprightness, or integrity." In this one term is comprehended what is elsewhere described as, "Thy people shall be all righteous, the work of my hands that I may be glorified"; or again: "a kingdom of priests and a holy people." As such an ideal, Israel, the servant of God, is destined to be a light to the nations and to bring unto them righteousness or salvation. If Israel possesses this lofty destiny and historic mission "for the latter days," its existence has an *exceptional* significance. Its beginnings are therefore represented in a peculiar light, and certainly were of an extraordinary character. It is an undoubted fact that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt, an undoubted fact that they left the land of their captivity, and equally certain that in order to reach the land in which they undeniably lived for seven hundred years, they had to pass through a terrible wilderness. These events, together with the passage of the Red Sea and the revelation of the Decalogue, which the older poetry glorified, and in so doing confirmed, were looked upon as the gracious proofs of a special Divine guidance. The prophet Jeremiah calls those days the bridal state of Israel. These first chapters of Israel's national history were to be all the more zealously remembered, inasmuch as they were to serve as an encouragement to remain steadfast through thousands of years of inward and outward trials and temptations. Israel's servitude and misfortunes at the beginning of its history, and its subsequent deliverance through a wonderful providence, were therefore immortalised by special ritual observances. The law itself does not enforce these observances as ends in themselves, but designates them as *means* for a higher end, "so that thou mayest remember all the days of thy life." In these words the connection between the spiritual essence of Judaism and a considerable part of its ritual observances is clearly designated: they are the means to an end, and that end is the memory of the past. National memories are dear to every nation; they urge it on to activity, to the maintenance of what it has already achieved, and to the increase of its fame. But the people of Israel was to pride itself not on the great deeds of its ancestors, but on the Divine guidance, which had shaped its destiny; and its national memories were intended to keep alive and unforgotten its own exceptional position and significance.

Another consideration is the following. This tribe was to be the bearer and guardian of what, in modern language, we should call moral and religious truth. But it lived among nations who despised these truths, or rather it lived among

a polytheistic and orgiastic world. Contagion from this world was inevitable and did not fail to come. Polytheistic error had so entirely undermined morality, that the law had to threaten with severe punishment fathers who sacrificed their children to Moloch, or who sacrificed their daughters' purity to other shameful divinities. It had to forbid the price of prostitution being brought into the temple. Sins which we now regard as impossible, and cannot reflect on without a shudder, must therefore have become domiciled amongst the Israelites just as they were in Babylon, Tyre, Corinth, and throughout the ancient world. Hence the continual relapse of the people to the abominations of polytheism and apostasy, which recurred even after the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, until at the return from the Babylonian captivity the apparently inexhaustible tendency to idolatry was finally overcome.<sup>1</sup>

The law, the "Torah," had therefore to take measures by which to wean the people from its polytheistic aberrations. Just as the Great Synagogue in the post-exilic period introduced "hedges" forbidding certain things that had been hitherto permitted, in order to prevent some essential law from being transgressed, so the Torah prescribed a series of ritual observances, which were intended to counteract polytheism and its worship. We may call them anti-polytheistic observances. Separatism followed as necessarily as B follows upon A. In the Pentateuch, stress is even laid upon separatism. The preservation of national memories and the necessity of exclusiveness made ceremonialism indispensable. The observances have thus either a mnemonic or a prophylactic character. Those which were to remind the people of their early history have necessarily a national character. First comes the institution of the festivals. The rationalists at the end of the last and beginning of the present century thought they were attaching an ineradicable stigma to

---

<sup>1</sup> The views of modern criticism, that represent both David and Solomon as polytheists, and fix the date when Yahvism developed into monotheism at as late a period as possible, are contradicted by the fact that in Solomon's Temple the Holy of Holies (קדש הקדשים) lay towards the west, just as in the description of the Tabernacle, the entrance to it was in the east, and the Holy of Holies in the west. As Helios was worshipped by almost all nations, the centre of the temple, the *Adyton*, was turned towards the east. The contrast between the Israelitish and the polytheistic temple arrangements is strikingly given in Ezekiel viii. 17. He saw twenty-five Israelites, worshippers of idols, standing at the entrance of the inner temple, towards which they turned their backs, while they looked towards the east, and prayed to the sun in the east, והמה משתחויתם קדמה לשמש. If Solomon had been still a polytheist, he must have placed the Holy of Holies in his temple in the east.



Judaism by proving that the two great festivals of Passover and Tabernacles were originally nature festivals, commemorating the beginning and end of the harvest. No doubt they were so originally, but they were converted into national festivals. In this assimilation or metamorphosis, is shown the spiritual energy which stamped its mark on all it found. The new ethical and religious conceptions had no *tabula rasa* before them; it was a people already accustomed to certain habits and institutions, which had to receive, preserve, and develop them. Thus the festival of the spring was converted into a national festival, to remind the people of their deliverance from slavery; and the harvest festival, the grape and fig harvest, which was spent in the open air and in booths, became a reminder of the many years spent in the wilderness. The exodus from Egypt was further to be called to mind by the redemption and sanctification of the first-born, by the removal of leavened bread, by the wearing of certain visible signs (phylacteries and tefillin) on forehead and hands, and possibly also by the blue fringes on the edges of the garment. If it should be proved that the nobles of Egypt wore fringes either for ornament or in compliance with some religious custom, we should here again have an example of the transformation of an old custom into a symbol of a loftier conception of life. It has not yet been made quite clear in what the so-called phylacteries (פְּטִילִיּוֹת, זכרון) and tefillin (אֹרֵת) originally consisted. As they are enforced in Deuteronomy, they must have been of considerable importance, inasmuch as the fifth book of Moses frequently modifies the injunctions of the central three.

As the book of Deuteronomy accentuates more sharply than the others the fundamental monotheistic doctrine, it uses the law of Tefillin and Phylacteries, as well as that of the Mezu-zot, to impress and to sharpen the monotheistic idea. The special significance of this commandment lay, no doubt, in the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one," which were to be fastened to every door-post, so that everybody at every moment of the day might be exhorted to conceive the God of Israel as a perfect Unity.

As I have already explained in my first article, this confession, or more accurately, this consciousness of monotheism, was not intended to be an article of faith, but an antithetical protest against polytheism; and polytheism was abhorred, not so much on account of its logical error, but first and foremost because of its incitement to ethical corruption. Hence the prophylactic ceremonials. Paganism laid special stress upon sacrifices to the dead, which originated in hero-

worship. The departed kings, national leaders and heroes, were represented as continuing to exist in Hades or elsewhere, transfigured into divinities (*manes divi*). This was the foundation of the superstition respecting evil spirits and demons. In Egypt especially, the deceased kings entombed in their pyramids, were made the objects of an elaborate system of worship. The mummies were considered sacred. The Israelite conception of God had to protest energetically against adoration of the dead, and it consequently pronounced the state of death to be unclean and a source of pollution. To touch a corpse, even that of a parent or a king, made a man unclean. Whoever had come in contact with a corpse, a skeleton, or a funeral feast, was not permitted to enter the sanctuary of the holy God until he had submitted himself to a seven days' purification, which purification had also a symbolical meaning. This is the probable origin of the Levitical laws of purification, against which so many objections have been raised. Perhaps it is only a natural sequence that dead animals were also pronounced unclean, with reference to the Egyptian custom of holding sacred the dead bodies of animals that were worshipped as divine.

It is possible that the command not to eat the flesh of certain quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and reptiles also had its origin in the reaction against the Egyptian worship of animals, which even included reptiles (רמם). This explanation is further suggested by the warning to avoid uncleanness by touching the carcasses of such animals, and also by the motive given for the institution of these laws: "Ye shall sanctify yourselves and be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy, therefore you shall not defile yourselves."

Two of the sacrificial rites were certainly introduced as a counterblast against the Egyptian animal worship. The laws respecting the *red heifer* are extremely remarkable. A red heifer, that had never borne a yoke, was to be taken outside the camp and burnt to ashes. The person who accomplished the process was thereby rendered unclean, and yet the ashes were to be used for purification in cases of Levitical pollution. Even to the Talmudists, who were not apt to be taken aback by irrationalities, this ceremony appeared exceedingly strange. But when we remember that the bull (Mnevis) worshipped in certain districts by the Egyptians had always to be red in colour and never to have borne the yoke, the Pentateuchal ritual of the *red heifer* becomes intelligible. The god-ox or god-heifer was to be destroyed, and the "Parah adumah" represents the climax of pollution. The ceremony of mixing the ashes with water and sprinkling it with a bunch of

hyssop, as a means of purification had, no doubt, also a symbolical meaning.

The rite of the scape-goat, which has so often served in the past as well as in the present for the slandering of Judaism, finds a complete explanation by reference to the Egyptian worship. In that country the goat was worshipped on account of its lasciviousness, as is related by two eye-witnesses, Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. One could not possibly repeat in a living language the horrible details given by the latter historian concerning this worship. A Latin translation may be quoted here.<sup>1</sup> Women used openly to practise bestiality with goats; this was part of the religious ceremonial. The Israelites were wont to imitate even this abominable goat worship; therefore the Law (Lev. xvii. 7) admonishes them "to sacrifice no more unto *goats*, after whom they have gone a whoring." For this reason the scape-goat, *i.e.*, the symbol or essence of unchastity, was to be sent away into the wilderness, to "a land cut off" (ארץ גזירה), which was called Azaz-El, and there, according to the traditional interpretation of the passage, it was to be flung over a precipice. But before this conclusion of the ceremony, the high priest was to lay his hands upon the scape-goat and confess and renounce all the sins and transgressions of the people of Israel, that is to say all idolatrous and obscene worship. With all this the celebration of the Day of Atonement is also closely connected, and certainly the Israelites could not do sufficient penance for having yielded to the debasing and disgusting worship of Astarte and the goats.

It is thus evident that the ceremonial system in its origin stood in near relation to the fundamental idea or essence of Judaism; that its office was to promote and combine with that essence, and that it was not by any means invested with a magical character (as was the case with the cult of ancient religion generally), in order to check the interference of demoniacal powers (*ἀποτροπιασμός*) or to conciliate the gods and appease their anger. Now the sacrificial ritual in the Pentateuch accords so little with the essence of Judaism that some prophets openly proclaimed its inappropriateness. The combination of these heterogeneous elements into one

---

<sup>1</sup> *Diodorus Siculus*, I., 88. Hircum ob genitale membrum inter Deos retulere, quomodo apud Græcos etiam Priapum honorari perhibent. Animal enim hoc in Venerem eximie propensum; et membrum illud corporis, generationis instrumentum, honore dignum esse, quod ab eo natura animantium ortum suum derivet. Denique pudenda, ajunt, non apud Aegyptios tantum, sed apud alios quoque non paucos in mysteriorum ritibus religiose habentur, ut a quibus generatio animalium promanat.

uniform teaching positively invites criticism. The explanation given by Maimonides was that the sacrificial ritual was a concession to the customs of the Israelites, who were used to heathen ideas, and that the commands concerning it were only a pedagogical means for setting bounds to the craving after sacrifice (*Moreh Nebuchim*, 3, 32). But this explanation leaves the contradiction unsolved. If it was really a pedagogic means, it failed to attain its end, for the multitude considered the sacrificial worship so essentially important, and the ethical laws of so little value in comparison to it, that the prophet Isaiah was compelled to declare: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. . . . Make you clean, put away the evil of your doings" (chapter i.).

This part of Leviticus, however, shows itself externally as well as internally to be a foreign element. A fortunate chance led, in the reign of Josiah, to the discovery of the beautiful book of Deuteronomy, which has an obvious tendency to modify the sacrificial worship, and reduce it to a minimum. One of its most noticeable injunctions is: "If thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee" (Deut. xxiii. 22). Next, there is not a word about sin offerings or guilt offerings, but only about peace and thank offerings, which were to be sacrificed, and eaten in the family circle. The ethical side of the ceremony is, moreover, strongly insisted on. The Levites, who had "no part or possession" of their own, the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the stranger, were to be invited to share the feast. Unlike the older code, the book of Deuteronomy attaches no sacred character to the firstlings of the cattle; and, instead of assigning them to the priesthood, ordains that they are to be eaten (like the festive offerings) in the family circle, while the poor must be allowed to have their share. Only on one ceremonial point does Deuteronomy lay special stress, and that is that no sacrifices were to be offered except in the one central and chosen locality.

Deuteronomy sought to deprive the priesthood of the greater portion of the tribute assigned to it in Leviticus; only a small part of the sacrifices, together with the first-fruits of corn, wine, oil and wool were to be allotted for its support. The tithes were to be the property of the owners of the cattle and the ground, on condition that they shared them with the poor.

The book of Deuteronomy breathes another atmosphere than Leviticus. Ceremonialism occupies only a small portion

of it, while the ethical precepts are treated at length and enforced with heart-moving earnestness. It is one of the fatalities that have hindered the development of Judaism that the line laid down by Deuteronomy was not followed up. On the contrary, one excess has caused another. Because the Torah was known and valued but little and by few during the centuries of the first temple, while the tendency to polytheism remained persistent till the time of the Babylonian captivity, and because during that period the conviction became vivid and strong that the chastisements threatened by the prophets had come to pass in consequence of obstinate transgression of the Law, the general post-exilic view was, that all its commands and precepts must be minutely and conscientiously obeyed or else a new judgment would overtake the guilty community. As there was then more opportunity for carrying out the ceremonial than the moral laws, these came to the front, and post-exilian Judaism received a ceremonial character. In addition to this there came the advice of the Great Synagogue to make a fence round the law, without considering the injunction not to set the fence above the plantation.<sup>1</sup> Thus in order to prevent some remotely possible infringement of a law, the erewhile permitted became now forbidden. The rigorousness of the Talmudists was grafted on the hedge of the Soferim, and on that of the Talmudists the scrupulousness of Rabbinism and the superstitions of the Kabbala. During the long years of persecution and suffering, the few voices that were raised in warning against this excess of ceremonialism passed unheard; Judaism gradually assumed a repellent aspect. As a consequence there followed (and there follows still) apostasy. The pure well-spring of Judaism, the Bible, was so buried under all this accumulation that it almost seemed to have disappeared altogether. The system of instruction was as erroneous as the habitual method of thought. The natural consequence was that as soon as the first ray of enlightenment penetrated the Ghetto, throwing upon the outward aspect of Judaism a sudden and glaring light, indifference and apostasy followed close upon each other. Nothing but the strong sense of family union, deepened and fortified by centuries of suffering, offered resistance. Now that at the present day the outward appearance of Judaism has assumed a more attractive form, and the uncultivated Polish customs have been nearly banished from the public ceremonial (while Christianity, on the other hand, has lost something of its ancient halo), the apostates from Judaism are less numerous than those who are merely

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aboth di R. Nathan*, ed. Schechter, Version II., page 2.

indifferent ; indifference is chiefly caused by ignorance. For Judaism, which does not rest upon the broad basis of State institutions, indifference is far more deadly than apostasy. If this indifference is to be shaken into life, Judaism must more lavishly display and make use of its civilising riches ; it must seek to engrain the conviction that its apostolic mission is not yet ended. Long ago it lifted the ancient world out of the slough of moral corruption into which it had sunk, and although its right of original priority is ignored or denied, a part of its moral principles has been crystallised in State institutions, and has passed into the consciousness of all civilized humanity. Whereas the Latin race is more permeated with the spirit of Hellenism, the Anglo-Saxon race is penetrated with the Biblico-Judaic spirit ; because its mind is more directed to truth than to beauty. Now what has not been crushed by the mailed footsteps of history must be indestructible and of lasting value. Not in vain has the Jewish people continued to exist for more than three thousand years ; not in vain has it survived all catastrophes, caused by a succession of hostile forces, and even the immense disadvantage through the past eighteen hundred years of struggling as a small and a feeble minority against a powerful and hostile majority. Its continued existence—in itself a wonderful fact—is an irrefutable proof of its historical necessity, and what would the Jews be without Judaism, the body without the soul, the Levitical bearers without the ark of the covenant ?

H. GRAETZ.